

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PAPER NUMBER

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.

09/745,522 12/26/2000 Ian Brotherston K8000102US1 1784

7590 05/19/2005 EXAMINER

Mark W. Sajewycz FETSUGA, ROBERT M

Mark W. Sajewycz
Gowling Lafleur Henderson
Commerce Court West, Suite 4900
Toronto, ON M5L 1J3
CANADA

3751

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

ART UNIT

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
e ·		
Office Action Summary	09/745,522	BROTHERSTON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert M. Fetsuga	3751
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by so Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) M6 tatute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	?3 June 2003.	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in priority documents have bee ireau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper N	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/745,522

Art Unit: 3751

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-19, drawn to a seat, classified in class 4, subclass 237.
- II. Claims 20-28 and 36, drawn to a frame and seat, classified in class 4, subclass 483.
- III. Claims 29-31, drawn to a frame, seat and backrest, classified in class 4, subclass 480.
- IV. Claims 32-35, drawn to a seat and armrest, classified in class 4, subclass 254.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I, II, III and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, inventions I, II, III and IV have separate utility such as invention I being used without a frame or armrest, invention II being used without a backrest or armrest, and invention III being used without an armrest. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification which would lead to divergent

Art Unit: 3751

fields of search, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

2. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species I: Figs. 1-6;

Species II: Fig. 7; and

Species III: Fig. 9.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are considered to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37

Application/Control Number: 09/745,522

Art Unit: 3751

Page 4

CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP \$ 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert M. Fetsuga at telephone number 703/308-1506 who can be most easily reached Monday through Thursday.

Robert M. Fetsuga Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751